



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: 700 LEAVENS BLDG., 1401 L ST., NW  
Washington, D.C. 20591  
www.uspto.gov

*[Handwritten Signature]*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/902,310	07/10/2001	David W. Albrecht	SJ0920010016US1	8192

28722 7590 10/04/2002  
BRACEWELL & PATTERSON, L.L.P.  
P.O. BOX 969  
AUSTIN, TX 78767-0969

EXAMINER
PEREZ, GUILLERMO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2834	

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/902,310	ALBRECHT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Guillermo Perez	2834

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If the period for reply specified above is more than thirty (30) days, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.  
 2a)  This action is FINAL. 2b)  This action is non-final.  
 3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)  Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s), \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6)  Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.  
 7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10)  The drawing(s) filed on 10 July 2001 is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 11)  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a)  approved b)  disapproved by the Examiner.  
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.  
 12)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a)  All b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
 1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
 3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
 \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.  
 14)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
 a)  The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.  
 15)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.  
 4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Drawings***

Figures 2 and 3 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-3, 6-8, 11-13, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of Mita et al. (U. S. Pat. 5,684,352).

APA substantially teaches the claimed invention except that it does not show that the second gap reduces the magnetic flux leakage into the sleeve and a substantially negligible amount of flux crosses the first gap into the shaft. APA does not disclose that the second gap is in the range of 200-300 microns.

Mita et al. disclose that the air gap can be increased to reduce the amount of magnetic flux between the two magnetic members (column 2, lines 20-56).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to modify the size of the air gap as disclosed by Mita et al. for the purpose of reducing the amount of magnetic flux between the two magnetic members.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the size of the second air gap since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

2. Claims 4-5, 9-10, 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of Mita et al. as applied to claims 1, 7, and 12 above, and further in view of Suzuki et al. (U. S. Pat. 6,133,655).

APA and Mita et al. substantially teaches the claimed invention except that it does not show that the second gap is filled with a substantially non-permeable material nor an epoxy.

Suzuki et al. disclose the gap is filled with a substantially non-permeable material (151) for the purpose of reducing the noises on the recording and the reproducing head.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to modify the machine of APA and Mita et al. and provide it with the substantially non-permeable material disclosed by Suzuki et al. for the purpose of reducing the noises on the recording and the reproducing head.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use epoxy as the substantially non-permeable material since it

has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

**Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Guillermo Perez whose telephone number is (703) 306-5443. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nestor Ramirez can be reached on (703) 308 1371. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305 3432 for regular communications and (703) 305 3432 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308 0956.

Guillermo Perez  
October 1, 2002

  
NESTOR RAMIREZ  
ASTOR RAMIREZ, JR.  
SUPERVISOR, DESIGN PATENTS  
TECHNOLOGY DIVISION  
RECEIVED OCT 1 2002